

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-14, 17-28, 30, and 32 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-14, 17-28, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-12, 24-28, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko (U.S. Patent No .6,134,030) in view of Sakurai (U.S. Patent No 5,924,802) and Matsumoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,611).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Sakurai, Matsumoto, and Minamizawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,074).

Claims 14 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Sakurai and Matsumoto.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Sakurai, Matsumoto, and Minamizawa.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 14, 24, 27, and 32 are amended.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7-14, 17-28, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, at least as amended herewith, are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has variously applied Kaneko, Sakurai, Matsumoto, and Minamizawa in rejecting each of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

As pointed out by the Examiner, Kaneko does not teach a signaling unit.

Sakurai discloses a printer to which an option unit 15 can be attached. The Examiner alleges that Sakurai discloses terminating the print software, but the Applicant respectfully disagrees. All the portions the Examiner points out in Sakurai concern changing a “printer driver”. Although the scanner is disclosed as an example of the option unit 16 in column 3, line 41, there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of controlling a scanner or of a signal read by the scanner being processed by the host computer 100 when the scanner is attached as the option unit 15. Specifically, referring to Fig. 5, the host computer 100 detects the device ID of the option unit 15 which is connected to the printer, then determines a “printer driver” which supports the printer with the attached option unit 15 to perform printing.

Further, there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of automatically launching scanner software when a scanner is attached as the optional device 15, nor of making an image read by the scanner visible. Moreover, Sakurai, for example, does not even disclose a display device nor where an image read by the scanner is inputted.

It is further noted that while Sakurai may disclose changing a printer driver depending on an ID signal of the option unit 15, there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of, for instance, terminating a printer driver. At least in view of the fact that a plurality of printer drivers can be launched and can be simultaneously operating in an information processing apparatus after changing a printer driver, the Applicant believes it clear that changing a printer

driver and terminating a printer driver are two different things.

Turning to Matsumoto, the Applicant notes that Matsumoto is aimed at executing a plurality of functions of a composite apparatus in parallel (column 1, lines 39-53). The CPU 101 in column 12, lines 15-30, and column 16, lines 23-29 noted by the Examiner is incorporated in the composite apparatus. There is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of CPU 101 terminating the print application if the print software is operating when the reader is selected or installed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest terminating print software if the print software is operating. As another example, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest allowing display of an image read by a reader when the reader is selected or installed. At least in view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

V. Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may



be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500,
Order No. 1232-4465. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 3, 2004

By:

Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 415-8746
(212) 751-6849 (Fax)